

GORDON E. HAYES

ATTORNEY AT LAW

Phone Main 62.

Probate Practice a Specialty

SIDELIGHTS THROWN ON OREGON POLITICS

(Continued From Page 1.)

received from members of the Oregon delegation. I at once conferred with Senator Mitchell, whom I told I could only convince Burns by surrendering this correspondence. Senator Mitchell advised me to turn over to Burns all such correspondence and since then I have given the Government all of the assistance I could in that direction. For this I do not expect any consideration from the Government, which has no case against me. Why, a jury of Chinamen would acquit me on the spot and they don't know anything about land frauds, either.

"At the session of 1903, Fulton and his friends thought I was entitled to something and decided to give me the District Attorneyship. I was given to understand that Hall was willing that I should have the office. Fulton had told me that the position was to be used to assist in securing his election to the United States Senate. But after Steiwer voted for Fulton I don't believe Hall ever expected that I would be appointed his successor.

"Yes, I probably wrote a letter to Mitchell in 1902, indorsing Hall, but I was writing letters for nearly everybody then, even tried one time to get something for Mrs. Woodcock."

Brownell's letter to Mitchell, April 2, 1902, was introduced by the defense. In that letter Brownell said he had concluded that after looking over the situation in Multnomah County he had decided that it would be better for Hall to be retained in his position, as it would be more satisfactory to Mitchell and to the party than to have a new man named. Brownell further testified that the first intimation he had that the Government had him under suspicion was late in the fall of 1902, before he was elected President of the Senate, when he was so advised in a conversation with Jonathan Bourne, Jr., Mr. Gates, of Washington County, and W. P. Keady. The scheme at that time, testified Brownell, was to get him to recommend Mr. Gates as successor to Henry Mel drum, United States Surveyor-General for Oregon. At that time Bourne told Brownell that Greene had told Gates that Brownell had at one time improperly used his notarial seal in acknowledging some survey applications.

The following letter was offered as evidence in the Hall case, but was rejected, because it did not relate to the case at bar. The letter, however, coming from Mr. Brownell to Senator Mitchell, throws some interesting sidelights on Oregon politics, and it is produced:

Oregon City, Or., Oct. 28, 1903. Hon. John H. Mitchell, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.—My Dear Sir and Friend: As I told you at the time, I knew that Hall would try to make it appear that I had some connection with Mel drum and Wagner in some things that occurred in the Surveyor-General's office. He called me to see him yesterday, the grand jury being in session, and threatened me, of course claiming that Hitchcock and Green were pressing him to this. He gave me to understand, after I told him that I was in no way connected and in no way to blame, that even if I was not, the fact of my being indicted would destroy my political chances, as the Oregonian would magnify it. I am now satisfied that Fulton has known about this all along, as the night he went away to Washington I cautioned him about informing Hall about the arrangements to give this place to Campbell. If Fulton had done as I asked him to do, Hall would not now be pressing me, as I had told Hall that day that I had released Fulton so far as I was concerned. I explained all this to Fulton and he said to me that he would simply tell Hall that he did not know what the delegation was going to do and could not tell until they met in Washington. Hall now tells me that Fulton told him that Campbell was to be appointed and I was to have the division of his salary. He finally said to me that if I was going to give him a letter to you and to Fulton indorsing him as United States District Attorney, that he would stop any proceedings against me, and as an evidence of the value of his services, tells me that he would have trouble with Hitchcock and Greene, as they were very anxious to have an indictment brought in against Mel drum, Wagner and myself. Therefore I wrote him such a letter, indorsing him to you and Fulton both, for U. S. District Attorney. F. C. Baker, who is chairman of the state committee, advised me to do this and said he would see you and Fulton and insist that I did right in doing it. Now, my dear friend, it is up to you and Fulton to say whether I am going to suffer any more in order to let Hall hold

over. If Fulton had done what he ought to have done, I would have had the place when he went back to take his oath of office. Hall has been given all opportunity to work every conceivable string against me that he could and now I believe that Fulton knew it and has expected him to do it and has stood in with him. You must remember that unless Campbell gets this place I am at the end of my string so far as reorganizing Clackamas County. You must remember that my present strength in this county for renomination is based upon my combination with Dimick for County Judge, Schuebel for chairman of the county central committee in place of J. U. Campbell, and the whole thing will break to pieces unless I can land Campbell in this place. Now, if you and Fulton stand up and do this, I will be enabled to be renominated for the Senate and if Hermann is knocked out I can be a candidate for his place and nominate a man for the State Senate in my place who will be for you and Fulton. Now, my dear friend, I have not got a dollar in the world, and not only that, I have got to go to the hospital very soon, and I have got about as much trouble as I can stand, and I want you, for old friendship's sake, to help me in this way and make Fulton stand up to it.

With best wishes for you and Fulton's health and success, I remain, Sincerely your friend, GEO. C. BROWNELL.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Another letter, written in answer to the above, came from Mitchell to Mr. Brownell, and follows: Strictly confidential. Don't show Hall or anybody. Committee on Coast Defenses, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1903, Hon. George C. Brownell, Attorney at Law, Oregon City, Or.

My Dear Friend Brownell: I am this morning in receipt of your three letters, one dated Oregon City, October 20, but mailed October 27, and the other without date, but mailed the same date, October 28, consequently I am unable to say which of the latter two was written first.

Now, my friend, I am perfectly astounded and grieved beyond expression not at you, I do not mean this, but at the man who has threatened you and driven you to do what you have done in the way of giving letters. I am writing you now in absolute confidence. What he has done, if brought to the attention of the Department, would not only prevent his reappointment, but would result in his removal most unceremoniously. No prosecuting officer, whether he has a case or has not, against any man, has any right to agree to withhold the prosecution, the consideration being an indorsement for him for reappointment. As I say, I am amazed beyond expression that he would do a thing of that kind and but for your positive statement to the contrary, I should not believe it. You are, however, I am sure, absolutely wrong in regard to Fulton. Ever since he came here in frequent talks I have had with him he has earnestly adhered to his intention to support Campbell for the place as he promised you he would do before leaving. I cannot believe that he told Hall that Campbell was to be appointed. Upon the contrary, my dear friend, and now I am going to tell you something; you told it yourself and I will tell you when you did it, as I heard of it shortly afterward from two different sources. You remember, my dear friend, when you took a little too much beer for a few days some time before we left. While under its influence you did some talking that you would not have done but for the beer. Two different men with whom you talked of politics and various sundry things, came to me and asked me if it was true that Campbell was to be appointed. I told them I had heard nothing of the matter. They then told me you had said that was to be the outcome of the whole business, which I denied most emphatically. I am sure you are wrong in blaming Fulton, at least I believe you are, because from the very first, in all our talks from the time I returned to Oregon last summer up to the present time Fulton has stood squarely and solidly for you personally, or, in the event you did not want it, then for whoever you might wish to have the place. As the matter now stands I am at a loss to know, from all your letters taken together, notwithstanding all that has taken place, if it is still your wish if we cannot agree upon you or Moreland, that we should unite in agreeing upon Campbell, or whether you really desire that we should ask the reappointment of Hall. I want to do in this matter just what is for your interest and that which will protect you and help you in every possible way. I think you have been treated shamefully in this matter by Hall, and as at present advised, I tell you I do not feel very much like asking his reappointment. Let me hear from you fully and plainly upon receipt of this letter as to just precisely what you think should be done.

Sincerely regretting that you have become involved in this trouble, and I am sure you have not been guilty of anything for which you should be indicted, I am, sincerely your friend, (Signed) JOHN H. MITCHELL, P. S.—As yet, as per request contained in your telegram, I have not shown any of your letters to Fulton.

CAPTAIN LARKINS IS DEAD.

Master of Steamer Lurline Falls Victim to Heart Disease. Captain William E. Larkins, master of the steamer Lurline, dropped dead of heart disease in the pilot-house of the steamer as the vessel was passing through the draw of the Steel bridge, starting on her regular trip from Portland to Astoria, Monday morning. Pilot McCully was in the pilot-house at the time, and as the stricken master sank to the deck the pilot assumed the wheel. Pilot McCully landed the steamer at Alsworth dock and immediately telephoned for a doctor, but Captain Larkins was dead when the physician arrived.

Captain William E. Larkins was among the most widely known steamboat men on the Pacific Coast. He was born in Benton County, Or., in 1857. When 17 years of age he shipped as a deckhand on the old steamer Alice, operating between Oregon City and Corvallis. Since that time he has been continuously engaged on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers.

A widow, three sisters and a brother survive. Mrs. Larkins is now at Nome, where she went last season to attend to some mining properties. The brother and sisters reside in and near Portland. The body was removed from the steamer to Finley's undertaking establishment. The funeral was held at the Methodist church in Oregon City, Wednesday, at 2 p. m.

OREGON PIONEER OF 1845.

B. F. Newman, Former Oregon City Hotel Man, Passes Away. B. F. Newman, one of Oregon's oldest pioneers, who died in Portland a few days ago, was born in Lee County, Iowa, in 1840. When he was five years old he came to Oregon with his parents, the Newmans coming in a party of thirty families. They located at The Dalles, but the Newmans moved to Salem soon after, where they settled on a donation land claim.

Mr. Newman's father was killed by the Indians, and, upon his death, B. F. Newman and his mother moved to Oregon City in the early 70s. The deceased had five brothers, and two sisters, of whom G. W. Newman, of Los Angeles County, Cal., is left.

B. F. Newman married Miss Ella J. Hawkins in 1874, and there were born to them five daughters and two sons. Of these the following survive him: E. Newman, Mrs. Joseph Slosson, Mrs. C. Gannell, and Miss Maty Newman, all of Portland; Mrs. Ethel Davis, of Forest Grove, and Mrs. J. Donnelly, of Sacramento, Cal.

Mr. Newman was in the hotel business in Oregon City in the early days and had a wide acquaintance among the early settlers. He moved to Portland in 1892, where he had since lived. His remains were interred in River-view Cemetery beside those of his wife in the family plot.

Miss Is